DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 349 899 HE 025 820

AUTHOR Miller, Michael T.; Seagren Alan T.
TITLE Personal Incentives as Motivational Sources for Chief Academic Development Officers.
INSTITUTION Nebraska Univ., Lincoln.
SPONS AGENCY Council for the Advancement and Support of Education, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE [92]
NOTE 16p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Achievement Need; *Administrator Effectiveness; Administrators; College Administration; *Fund Raising; Higher Education; Incentives; Institutional Advancement; *Motivation
IDENTIFIERS Chief Executive Officers; *Development Officers (College)

ABSTRACT

A study was done to investigate the role of chief academic development officers (CADOs) as fund raisers for institutions of higher education in relation to program success and work motivation. The study was designed to: (1) profile the personal motivation of CADOs in higher education; (2) see if significant differences existed in what motivates successful and less successful CADOs; and (3) see if significant differences in personal motivation existed between CADOs and other professionals. A concept of work motivation based on notions of personal investment and personal commitment was used. The selected sample consisted of 30 chief academic development officers in higher education, 15 of whom represented higher education institutions whose endowment sizes increased at least 27 percent during 1988 and 1989 fiscal years, and 15 of whom were from institutions whose endowment increased 1 percent or decreased during the same time period. The participants completed a questionnaire that included four subscales designed to measure accomplishment, affiliation, recognition and power. Analysis of the 22 usable questionnaires indicated significant differences among the personal incentives, particularly between accomplishment and all other values and between the mean scores of recognition and power. Results also indicated that CADOs may be more similar to other professionals than previously believed. (Contains 4 tables and 26 references.) (JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Personal Incentives as Motivational Sources for Chief Academic Development Officers

ED349899

Dr. Michael T. Miller
Assistant Professor and Director
Research and Development Unit for Vocational Education

Department of Vocational and Adult Education
530 East Nebraska Hall
University of Nebraska-Lincoln
Lincoln, Nebraska 68588-0553

(402) 472-3337
FAX: (402) 472-5907

Dr. Alan T. Seagren
Professor and Director
Center for the Study of Higher and Postsecondary Education

Department of Educational Administration
1218 Seaton Hall
University of Nebraska-Lincoln
Lincoln, Nebraska 68588-0638

(402) 472-3726

Running Head: CADO Personal Motivation

This study was made possible through a grant from the Council for the Advancement and Support of Education. The author wishes to acknowledge Dr. Judy Grace at CASE for her assistance in this project.

HE 025 820

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Michael T. Miller
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Abstract

As financial concerns increasingly cause concern for academic administrators, growing attention has focused on institutional fund raising. The greater focus on fund raising has not been limited to solicitation techniques, as the role and function of the chief academic development officer (CADO) has been identified as crucial to fund raising program success. The investigation presented here examines the CADO in relation to program success and work motivation. The investigation provided an indication that work motivation may not play as large a role in fund raising success as previously believed.

"Personal Incentives as Motivational Sources for Chief Academic Development Officers"

Educational fund raising is not a new concept, as reliance on 'alternative funding' generated through solicitations once provided the impetus for the survival of the Colonial Colleges (Curti & Nash, 1965). Academic fund raising has grown substantially since the 1940's, and in fiscal year 1990, $9.8 billion alone was raised for education (Council for Aid to Education, 1991). Despite the apparent growth of giving to education, in 1989 academic fund raising did suffer its first setback in over two decades, dropping by as much as 30% for some colleges. For a variety of reasons, such as increased competition and decreased tax incentives, the future of giving to higher education remains uncertain (Glennon, 1986; Hoeflich, 1987).

During this time of instability, increased attention has focused on those who raise money for the institution, often concentrating on the chief academic development officer (CADO) (Brakeley, 1980; Burdette, 1987; Willard, 1984). Conceptually, by better understanding these individuals fund raising program success and effectiveness can be better manipulated.

In the pursuit of a better understanding of those raising money, this study was designed to: (a) profile the personal motivation of CADOs in higher education; (b) see if significant differences existed in what motivates successful and less successful CADOs; and (c) see if significant differences in

personal motivation existed between CADOs and other professionals.

Framework of the Study

Both scholars and practitioners agree that the fundamental basis for a successful development program is rooted in the talent, skills, abilities, and motivation of the fund raising professional (Ast, Moore, & Rook, 1986).

To better understand the individual who can determine fund raising success, the chief academic development officer (CADO), two common themes have surfaced in relevant literature: internal motivation, and an ability to communicate with a variety of people and constituencies. The same themes have been identified in literature dealing with personal motivation. Maehr and Braskamp (1986) identified the desire for recognition, affiliation, accomplishment, and power in their Personal Investment Theory which held that personal values provide the internal drive to succeed.

The understanding of individual behavior based on personal incentives, measured through values, provides the ability for an individual to uncover why some professionals, in this case, chief academic development officers, out perform others (Johns & Taylor, 1987; Schwartz, 1988; Steers & Porter, 1975; Wood, 1989).

Background of the Study

Chief Development Officers

Numerous attempts have been made to profile and understand the chief development officer, yet, the majority of these offerings have been anecdotal and have drawn on personal experiences rather than research (Miller & Seagren, 1991; Willard, 1984).

For over 30 years the development officer has been described in terms of commitment, organizational abilities, and communication skills (Pollard, 1958). The same description of a development officer has been provided more recently, albeit, from personal perspectives (Burdette, 1987; Nichols, 1987).

Common perceived descriptors of the fund raising professional include an ability to articulate institutional aims (Stuhr, 1985); an ability to work with volunteers (Miller & Seagren, 1991; Battillo & Villanti, 1986); skill and trust in delegating authority (Matheny, 1987; Sorenson, 1986); committed to institutional and non-profit ideals (Brod, 1986); office management skills (Nichols, 1987); and satisfaction from "the knowledge that their work benefits people served by the institution" (Carbone, 1989, p. 8).

Research, however, has failed to determine an accepted set of criteria for success in fund raising (Willard, 1984). Both Rowland (1977) and Burdette (1987) advocated institutional specific criteria for determining what constitutes 'success,' and subsequently, what type of individual will best complement the

institution's environment.

Work Motivation

Workplace motivation has no isolated source, but rather, draws on a number of factors within and external to an individual environment (Chung, 1977; Scott & Cummings, 1973). As Chung noted, "employee motivation still presents continuous problems that need to be solved. The solution requires an understanding of the changing nature of work and workers" (p. 241).

Steers and Porter (1975) contended that the individual, the job, and the environment were the driving forces in personal motivation. Motivating factors have also been sorted into distinct categories: personal, environmental, and background, with personal and environmental factors being the primary sources of work motivation. Alternatively, emphasis has been placed on understanding and catering to individual needs, much the same as educational experiences cater to learning methods (Greive, 1983).

Unique to the study of motivation has been the Personal Investment Theory, advocated by Maehr and Braskamp (1986). They focused on personal values, including accomplishment, affiliation, achievement, and power, as creating feelings of ownership and subsequently, a motivation to work. Personal Investment was described as a combination of both external and psychological factors, filtered through an individual's thoughts and emotions, and resulting in performance, choice, intensity, and continuing motivation.

The Personal Investment concept was selected for additional examination in relation to the development officer, based largely on the needed personal commitment to the non-profit community advocated by current development officers.

Procedures

The selected sample consisted of 30 chief academic development officers (CADO) in higher education. Included in the 30 were 15 CADOs representing higher education institutions whose endowment sizes increased at least 27% during the 1988 and 1989 fiscal years, and 15 CADOs whose institutions increased their endowment 1% or decreased during the same time period. Despite the lack of consensus on fund raising effectiveness, the two groups were intended to represent "higher" and "lower" success in fund raising.

The 77-item Spectrum I Test of Adult Work Motivation (as provided from MetriTech, Inc.) was incorporated into the questionnaire. The Spectrum I is comprised of four subscales, each designed to measure an area of Personal Work Motivation: accomplishment, affiliation, recognition, and power.

Data for the comparison group of 'other professionals' were provided from MetriTech, Inc. Other professionals included group mean data for several occupations: executives and business owners; professional occupations such as medicine, law, clergy, and college faculty; mid-level corporation managers; pilots; lower management personnel; salespersons; technical and service

occupations; secretarial and clerical personnel; and primary and secondary school teachers. These data were collected by MetriTech, Inc. throughout the 1980s.

The instrument was administered in the 1991 academic year.

Results

Of the 30 questionnaires administered, 22 usable responses were received, representing a 73% return rate. Responses were received from 10 CADOs whose endowment size, under their direction, rose only 1% or decreased, while 12 responses came from CADOs whose institutional endowment increased at least 27%.

Responding to the Spectrum I Test of Adult Work Motivation, the combined group of CADOs were motivated primarily by a desire for accomplishment (x=73.5). The CADOs also had a strong sense of motivation by the desire for recognition (x=57.51), followed by a desire for affiliation and a desire for power (x=55.76 and x=46.95 respectively; see Table 1).

The personal values for motivation among lower-success CADOs varied little in rank order from the combined group responses, with the primary source of motivation the desire to accomplish tasks (x=73.5). Recognition (x=61.7) followed as the second most powerful incentive, with affiliation (x=55.7) and power (x=47.0) rounding out the subscale (see Table 2).

Personal incentives for higher-success CADO's differed little from the lower-success CADOs, with the possible exception being a desire for recognition. Again, the personal value of

accomplishment (x=73.5) was identified as the primary source of motivation, but was followed by a need or desire for affiliation (x=55.83), then recognition (x=53.33), and power (x=46.91; see Table 2).

Even though the lower and higher success CADOs and other professionals differed in their desires for recognition and affiliation, the difference between the groups was found not to be significant (alpha level .05; see Tables 2 and 3). A significant difference was noted among the personal incentives, however, and using the Tukey HSD, a significant difference was noted between accomplishment and all other values and between the mean scores of recognition and power (see Table 4).

Conclusion

The present study was designed to address the growing concern about development officers and their role in securing alternative funding sources for higher education institutions. Sources of motivation have been identified as fundamental issues related to fund raising success, and subsequently, this investigation was fashioned to profile and note differences in the motivational forces of chief academic development officers in higher education.

Using the Spectrum I Test of Adult Work Motivation, CADOs were found to be motivated by a desire to accomplish, and this held true for both higher success and lower success CADOs. Motivation based on accomplishment was found to be consistent

with other professionals. The implications of understanding CADO motivation are many, and fall across different components in the study of higher education. First, by understanding why individuals behave as they do, administrators are better able to offer incentives consistent with motivation. Second, results indicated that development officers may be more 'similar' to other professionals than previously believed. Based on these similarities, a number of training or in-service components currently employed by the private sector may be utilized with CADOs. Third, with a similarity in motivational incentives, CADOs may be recruited from other disciplines. And last, much of the research and understanding of motivation in the work setting may be supplanted in the development office with the belief that institutional advancement programs, while unique, offer the same basic challenges and issues as other administrative areas.

The chief academic development office continues to live in a setting filled with fiscal concern, office related issues, and constituents. The CADO must be more than a strong administrator, and must be willing and able to provide inspiration to scores of volunteers. With the completion of this study we can understand what motivates the development officer, but the higher education community must continue to search for a comprehensive understanding of institutional advancement.

References

Ast, S. T., Moore, W. M., & Rook, A. (1986). Getting a line on this line of work. NSFRE Journal, 6(2), 36-50.

Battillo, K., & Villanti, S. (1986). A manager's manual. Currents, 12(4), 10-13.

Brakeley, G. A. (1980). Tested ways in fund raising. NY: American Management Association.

Brod, I. (May 1986). Recruiting a fund raiser here are the qualities to look for. FRI Bulletin, 1-2.

Burdette, M. J. (1987). The mating dance. CASE Currents, 11, 12-16.

Carbone, R. F. (September 1989). Professional attitudes of fund raisers. NAHD News, 8.

Chung, K. H. (1977). Motivational theories and practices. Columbus, OH: Grid.

Council for Aid to Education. (1991). Sources of voluntary support for higher education, 1989-1990. The Chronicle of Higher Education Almanac, 38(1), 35.

Curti, M., & Nash, R. (1965). Philanthropy in the shaping of American higher education. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University.

Glennon, M. (1986). Fund raising in small colleges: Strategies for success. Planning for Higher Education, 14(3), 16-29.

Greive, D. (Ed.) (1983). Teaching in college. Cleveland, OH: Info-Tech.

Hoeflich, M. H. (1987). Prospects for college and university fund raising. Academe, 73(1), 30-32.

Johns, E. F. & Taylor, R. (1987). Personal investment and job satisfaction among community college resource development officers. Paper presented at the 95th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, New York, New York.

Maehr, M. L., & Braskamp, L. A. (1986). The motivation factor. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Matheny, R. E. (1987). Selective ignorance the effective manager's secret weapon. NSFRE Journal, 12(2), 14-16.

Miller, M. T., & Seagren, A. T. (March 1991). Characteristics of planned giving officers: Practicing professionals perceptions. Resources in Education (ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education Reproduction Service Number ED 325 032).

Nichols, D. A. (1987). Hire a theory D executive. AGB Reports, 29(5), 38-43.

Pollard, J. A. (1958). Fund raising for higher education. NY: Harper & Brothers.

Rowland, A. W. (Ed.). (1977). Handbook of institutional advancement. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schwartz, J. J. (1988). The current climate and trends in American philanthropy. The Journal of Contemporary Issues in Fund Raising, 37-45.

Scott, W., & Cumings, L. (Eds.). (1973). Readings in organizational behavior and human performance. Homewood, IL: Richard Irwin.

Sorensen, R. S. (1986). Take this job and love it. Currents, 12(2), 42-45.

Steers, R. M., & Porter, L. W. (1975). Motivation and work behavior. NY: McGraw-Hill.

Stuhr, R. L. (1985). What makes a successful development program. Momentum, 16(3), 10-12.

Willard, T. J. (1984) A study of the characteristics of successful chief development officers in selected private colleges and universities. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado.

Wood, E.W. (1989). Philanthropy: Past, present and future. The Journal of Contemporary Issues in Fund Raising, 6-8.

Table 1.

Group Motivation Responses as Measured through the Spectrum I Test of Adult Work Motivation

Personal Incentive	Mean Score
Accomplishment	73.50
Recognition	57.51
Affiliation	55.76
Power	46.95

Table 2.

Spectrum I Results for Lower and Higher Success CADOs and Other Professionals

Personal Incentive	Lower Success	Higher Success	Other Professionals
Accomplishment	73.50	73.50	74.95
Recognition	61.7	53.33	62.36
Affiliation	55.7	55.83	51.12
Power	47.0	46.91	45.50

Table 3.

Two Factor ANOVA Between Higher and Lower Success CADOs and Other Professionals

Source	df	SS	MS	F-Ratio
Among values	3	1210.8	403.6	40.89*
Among groups	2	8.76	4.38	.44
Within	6	59.23	9.87	
Total	11	59.27		

*p<.05, F=4.757

Table 4.

Mean Differences of CADO Personal Incentives

Personal Incentive	Mean	Affiliation	Recognition	Power
Accomplishment	73.5	17.74*	15.99*	26.50*
Affiliation	55.7		-1.75	8.7
Recognition	57.5			10.51*
Power	47.0			

Significant difference at p<.05; q=8.8